	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	10/519,663	HAGEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nathan M. Nutter	1796

C	ontinuation Sheet (PTOL-303)	Application No.
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet with the correspondence address
	THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the s application, applicant must timely file one of the following replie	ame day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this s: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ith appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
	periods:	
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	y Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). On MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on wh	ALY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
	have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17g. is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b), NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ned statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within t AMENDMENTS 	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
	 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pr (a) They raise new issues that would require further consider (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 	
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for appeal; and/or	rm for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
	(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and American Sheet.)	
	4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Set 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	e attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	Applicants reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).	 ie if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
	 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\subseteq \) whow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 	
	Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-25</u> .	
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
	8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before	re or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered cient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
	 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcoshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and 	me all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
	 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
	series or cascade may include other monomers, including the	opolypropylene is shown. The further production of polymers in olefins as taught at column 8 (lines 56-68). The particular ratios of
	expectation of success following the teachings of the reference	as alleged. As such, a skilled artisan would have a high level of e, using known constituents in know methods to produce uction of a homopolypropylene in the first step. Further, applicants
	have not shown with any comparative testing that a compositi "improved scratch resistance," which phrase in itself appears	on produced using the teachings of Huovinen et al would not have to be meaningless in context with the claims. Again, there are no , again it is pointed out that the first step recited in claim 1 does no
	exclude a copolymer being produced, for the matrix. Again, the	ere is no comparative testing to conclude any differences. As
		nat the compositional limitations for the ethylene and propylene and propylene recite a specific amounts of C2 in the EPR formed, othing has been shown on the record as regards unexpected
	results. All rejections of record are being maintained.	
	 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO: 13 Other 	Эв/ив) Paper No(s)